



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,642	02/12/2001	Takashi Sugitou	55587(1004)	8394

7590 02/09/2006

Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman
EDWARDS & ANGELL
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/781,642

Applicant(s)

SUGITOU ET AL.

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 7-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 7-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaudet (US 5,511,150) in view of Lobiondo (US 5,287,194).

Regarding claim 1: Beaudet teaches a multifunctional printing system (column 3, line 1) wherein image information captured through an image information pickup means (scanner, column 3, lines 10-15) can be printed as multiple sets of copies (column 1, lines 30-35) by a printing means (marking means, column 3, lines 20-25) and which is configured so that the printing operation can be stopped only at intervals from one set of copies to the next or every certain number of printouts, comprising: a computing means (control logics/programs of the copier, column 7, lines 9-12, column 10, lines 6) for calculating the time at which an interrupt copy and printing job can be entered next (fig. 4I), based on the designated number of print sets (column 9, lines 7-8, column 10, lines 1-5, column 1, lines 30-35), the current state of printing (the copier disable or not, column 6, lines 60-65), the information as to whether an interrupt is permissible (column 10, line 3); and a display means (fig. 4I) for displaying the permissible interrupt time calculated by the computing means.

Beaudet does not teach calculating and displaying a finish time for the request print job that is to be entered next for printing.

Lobiondo, in the same area of informing users of status of a print job (column 5, lines 5-15), teaches it is well known in the art to calculate and inform users of a finish time for a print job that is waiting to be printed while the printer is printing other jobs during a time that the other print jobs are not being interrupted (column 5, lines 16-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet to include: calculating and displaying a finish time for the request interrupted print job.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet by the teaching of Lobiondo because it would have allowed a user to know the finished time of his print job and would have allowed users to use another printing device for printing his print job if the user feels that the print completion time is too long, as taught by Lobiondo in column 5, lines 25-33.

Regarding claim 2: Beaudet teaches a multifunctional printing system (column 3, line 1) wherein image information captured through an image information pickup means (scanner, column 3, lines 10-15) can be printed as multiple sets of copies (column 1, lines 30-35) by a printing means (marking means, column 3, lines 20-25) and which is configured so that the printing operation can be stopped only at intervals from one set of copies to the next or every certain number of printouts and so that the printing operation needs to be stopped in order to allow an interrupt job (column 9, lines 9-20), comprising:

Art Unit: 2624

a computing means (control logics/programs of the copier, column 7, lines 9-12, column 10, lines 6) for calculating a permissible termination time (e.g., fig. 4I, column 10, lines 1-5) before an interrupt copying and printing job can be entered, based on the designated number of print sets (column 9, lines 7-8, column 10, lines 1-5, column 1, lines 30-35), the current state of printing (the copier disable or not, column 6, lines 60-65), the information as to whether an interrupt is permissible (column 10, line 3); and a display means (fig. 4I) for displaying the permissible termination time calculated by the computing means.

Beaudet does not teach calculating and displaying a finish time for the request print job that is to be entered next for printing.

Lobiondo, in the same area of informing users of status of a print job (column 5, lines 5-15), teaches it is well known in the art to calculate and inform users of a finish time for a print job that is waiting to be printed while the printer is printing other jobs during a time that the other print jobs are not being interrupted (column 5, lines 16-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet to include: calculating and displaying a finish time for the request interrupted print job.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet by the teaching of Lobiondo because it would have allowed a user to know the finished time of his print job and would have allowed users to use another printing device for printing his print job if the user feels

Art Unit: 2624

that the print completion time is too long, as taught by Lobiondo in column 5, lines 25-33.

Regarding claim 7: Beaudet teaches wherein the display means displays the time or time length in response to the operation of a dedicated key which allows for input of a display request (column 9, lines 4-10, fig. 4D, interrupt job is a dedicated key which allows the display of fig. 4I).

Regarding claim 8: Beaudet teaches wherein the display means displays the time or time length when the key for requesting an interrupt is operated (column 9, lines 4-10, fig. 4D, interrupt job is a dedicated key which allows the display of fig. 4I).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaudet and Lobiondo as applied to claims 1, 2 above, and further in view of Brown et al (US 5,327,487).

Regarding claim 9: Beaudet does not teach a voice generating means for informing the time or the time length via voice is provided instead of the display means.

Brown, in the same area of transmitting message to a user in a copier environment teaches message can be conveyed to a user by display and voice message (column 3, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet's message conveying method to include: a voice generating means for informing the time or the time length via voice is provided instead of the display means.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet by the teaching of Brown to have allowed blind person having the privilege of using Beaudet's copier machine.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that claims 1, and 2 has been amended to recite the limitations of claims 3 and 4 respectively; has been considered.

In reply: claims 3 and 4, filed on 7/21/2005, are claiming calculating the finish time of the requested interrupt job instead of calculating the permissible interrupt time.

In other words, permissible interrupt time is not being calculated, the time to be calculated is the finished time. In Beaudet, the time the permissible interrupt time is not being calculated is when the interrupted job is being printed. During printing of the interrupt job, the calculating device of Beaudet, instead of calculating the permissible interrupt time (there are no more permissible interrupt time for the interrupt job because the interrupt job is being printed), the calculating device calculates the finished time of the interrupt job continuously as shown in fig. 4F1 and fig. 4F2 (the interrupt job becomes the print job being printed currently).

The newly amended claims 1 and 2 do not has the limitation "instead of;" and thereby, does not recite the claimed limitations of claims 3 and 4 filed on 7/21/2005.

From the newly amend claims and the argument presented by the applicant on bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6 of the remark section filed on 12/23/2005, the finished time of the interrupt job is displayed before the interrupt job is in the process of being printed.

Beaudet does not teach calculating and displaying a finish time for the request print job that is to be entered next for printing.

Lobiondo, in the same area of informing users of status of a print job (column 5, lines 5-15), teaches it is well known in the art to calculate and inform users of a finish time for a print job that is waiting to be printed while the printer is printing other jobs during a time that the other print jobs are not being interrupted (column 5, lines 16-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet to include: calculating and displaying a finish time for the request interrupted print job.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Beaudet by the teaching of Lobiondo because it would have allowed a user to know the finished time of his print job and would have allowed users to used another printing device for printing his print job if the user feels that the print completion time is too long, as taught by Lobiondo in column 5, lines 25-33.

Art Unit: 2624

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 26, 2006


KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER